

we are talking about here tonight and that the gentlewoman has just finished speaking about.

The two nutrition programs that the gentlewoman has spoken of show savings by your own party's count and by the Congressional Budget Office of \$6.6 billion over the next 5 years. That is the school-based nutrition program and the family nutrition program. How can you be claiming savings on those programs if in fact there has not been something cut?

Mrs. MYRICK. We are talking about, what you are talking about, the only thing that has been cut is the increases that were requested that are not being increases in the same point.

Mr. OLVER. How can you get savings if you have not cut something?

Mr. HOKE. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. Yes.

Mr. HOKE. You get savings when you are using a baseline that is phony to begin with and you define savings as being a cut from an inflated number in the first place.

The fact is that we are going from some \$6.7 billion a year up to come \$7.8 billion a year in the year 2000. That is clearly an increase in spending. Only in Washington.

BASELINE BUDGETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, let us talk a little bit about phony baselines, which is where the gentleman on the other side of the aisle left off before the time expired. That is a funny place here inside the Beltway in Washington, DC.

The Pentagon gets its own special baseline. That is, at the Pentagon things are very expensive, you know, over there at the Pentagon. So they get not only the inflation that seniors get on Social Security or the inflation that anybody else might think about, they get their own special inflation index. And at the Pentagon a cut is a decrease in the increase.

So say next year the Pentagon determines its own little special inflation index is 6 percent. If they only get a 5 percent increase in their \$271 billion budget, that is if they only get an increase around \$11 billion, if they only get \$10 billion, that is a decrease, and we would hear screams from that side of the aisle. We heard screams earlier.

We have appropriated more money for the Pentagon this year. God forbid we should ask them to produce something. It costs extra.

We had to come up with a supplemental bill to pay for the Pentagon to do something. They couldn't squeeze it out of their \$271 billion budget.

Now with the nutrition programs, of course, they apply a different ruler. That is, are there going to be more kids going to school next year? Yes; is

food going to be more expensive next year? Yes.

There might even be a little bit of an increase in the wages for the people who cook those meals in the schools. A lot of them are getting minimum wage, and if we increase the minimum wage they will get a little bit more. Now in their world those increases don't count. Only increases in inflation for the Pentagon count.

So here is the world we are looking at. We know there will be more kids in school. We know there will be more need for those kids.

I visited a school lunch last week and talked about it last Monday night on the floor. So I won't repeat the stories about how hungry those kids are on Mondays and Fridays and what the needy really is. But the point is, in their world we will only give them enough money to increase it just a little bit. And if there are more kids, the portions get smaller. Or if there are more kids, ketchup becomes a vegetable again, whatever. We are just—can't afford those things.

But we can afford an infinite amount of money for the Pentagon. That is what is wrong with this debate. Let's put our priorities in order here. This debate is about priorities.

What will make America stronger tomorrow? Is it hungry kids who can't learn because we cut back on the school lunch program, the school breakfast program? Or is it imaginary programs like star wars and the fat defense contractors taking people out to dinner every night on the Federal budget, which we all know goes on with these Pentagon lobbyists.

So I would like to put it in that perspective. And let's just remember, when it comes to the Pentagon, a decrease and an increase is a cut, but when it comes to school lunches, a decrease in a real need is not a cut.

That is what the Republicans are trying to feed us here. It is about as real as feeding people ketchup and calling it a vegetable.

They talk a lot about the bureaucrats. I checked that out. I was disturbed about that. I thought, well, maybe they are right.

We could eliminate some of these administrative cuts if we eliminated every administrator. That is from the woman who runs the program downtown here in Washington, DC., down to the person who takes the little lunch tickets, to the person who cooks in the school. That is if Congress could miraculously appropriate the money and deliver the food straight to the kids with no one in between. That would be one-eighth of the cuts the Republicans are making in the real needs of these programs.

So it is a lie. It is a lie to say we just want to eliminate the bureaucrats. No, you can't just eliminate the bureaucrats. Where are you going to get the other seven-eighths of your cut?

The gentleman, Mr. OLVER, made a great point. How is it they can talk about \$7 billion, "b", billion dollars, in

savings in school nutrition programs, WIC programs and other children's nutrition programs and then tell us there aren't any cuts.

I would like to make \$7 billion in savings over at the Pentagon, and I would be happy to tell the Pentagon that those things don't constitute cuts. But we would hear screams from that side of the aisle because it is a different standard. It is a different ruler when it comes to kids. They come after the Pentagon.

STATE FUNDING AND CHILD NUTRITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, you know, every once in a while you have to come back to real numbers that will buy real groceries. And I am starting to even get confused listening to the other side. So what I want to know, and I would like to ask this of your, Representative HOKE.

I know where we are now, and I can't go home and tell anybody that we have increased the school lunch program unless it is in hard dollars. I know we are at \$6.296 billion right now a year on school lunches. I want to know how much it will take to feed those kids in later dollars, how much we put in the budget, and I want to make sure we feed those kids as many lunches as we are feeding now. You show me that.

Mr. HOKE. Okay. This has got to be so incredibly confusing to the American public watching this and trying to discern what is really going on. I can't imagine what could be more confusing until finally you are going to have to decide somebody is telling the truth and somebody is lying. Let me review.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I just want real numbers. I don't want anything spun. How much are we going to spend in this budget compared to the last budget?

Mr. HOKE. March 20, 1995, from the Congressional Research Service. Let me just read the preamble.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. That is the nonpartisan group?

Mr. HOKE. Yes, that is the nonpartisan group. It is anybody, any Member of Congress can ask them to do research. Let me read this. Then I will go directly to the numbers.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Thank you.

Mr. HOKE. All right. This is from Jean Yavis Jones. She is a specialist in Food and Agriculture Policy in the Food and Agriculture Section. The subject is Child Nutrition: State funding under current law and block grants proposed in H.R. 1214. That is what we are talking about, the nutrition block grants.

This memorandum responds to numerous congressional requests for information on the effect that recent

proposals to block grant child nutrition programs would have on the States. The attached tables compare estimates of fiscal year 1995 and fiscal year 1996 funding to States under current law to the estimated amount of funding that States would receive under the child nutrition block grants contained in H.R. 1214 as introduced on March 13, 1995.

Now, let me go to the table. Here is the table. This is school-based block grants and current law funding by States and the total. I am going to give you the total. The total for all the school-based nutrition programs for fiscal year 1995 was \$6.295 billion.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Does that include breakfast and the feeding programs?

Mr. HOKE. That is breakfast, that is after school, that is school lunches, school snacks, all. There are five programs in all. The amount that is estimated by CBO for fiscal year 1996 under current law is \$6.607 billion. That takes into account, and I will read it to you exactly.

What it does, it says that those amounts are based, it takes into account the adjustments that will show the projected and actual changes in overall Federal obligations, and it takes into account the number of students that will be in the program and also inflation. So it takes into account exactly what my friends on the other side of the aisle are talking about.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. So increases in food and increases in kids?

Mr. HOKE. Precisely. Precisely. So that is what the current law is, okay? \$6.296 billion in fiscal year 1995 to \$6.607 billion in fiscal year 1996.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Now that is what they say we will need to keep up, to make sure we don't get behind?

Mr. HOKE. We need to get to \$6.607 billion in 1996.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Where are we then in the budget?

Mr. HOKE. The school-based block grant is at \$6.681 billion, \$6.681 billion. The difference between the block grant and the fiscal year 1996 CBO estimate that takes into account the demographic changes as well as the inflation is \$73 million.

In other words, under the block grant program, the Republican program that is being criticized here in a bombastic way, that doesn't begin to square with the facts. We are increasing the funding for school nutrition programs by \$73 million in fiscal year 1996.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Actually, we are increasing it \$384 million, but part of that is to keep up with costs of inflation and new children. So we are going over what it costs and kicking in \$74 million, sending it back to the States and saying get your grubby hands off it at the State level, don't spend much on administration, get it back to kids?

Mr. HOKE. You are absolutely right, Linda. We are, in fact, increasing it by \$384 million over what we are spending

in 1995. We are increasingly it by a third, more than a third of a billion dollars.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Well, this grandma likes that. I think we have done a great job.

NUTRITIONAL PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have had some protestations, particularly from the gentleman from Cleveland or just outside of Cleveland, with respect to baselines. Mr. DEFAZIO spoke of baselines.

And the question and answers, we pretend that there can be a savings which is going to be applied to a tax cut and for the wealthiest in America, but that somehow this savings doesn't cost anybody anything. It is a free lunch. It is sort of like supply-side economics that was brought to us in 1981, and we were told that the budget would be balanced as a result of supply-side economics by October 1, 1983.

Mr. HOKE. Would you yield for one single question?

Mr. HOYER. Four and one-half trillion dollars later.

Mr. HOKE. Have you, have you seen the CRS report?

Mr. HOYER. I have not.

Mr. HOKE. Would you like to have a copy of it?

Mr. HOYER. I would love to have a copy of it.

Mr. HOKE. It is working from the baseline. It shows the increase off the baseline.

□ 2115

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman asked me to yield. Will the gentleman yield?

Where does this savings, this magic savings come from that Mr. KASICH is applying to the tax cut?

Mr. HOKE. It is not in this school-based nutrition program.

Mr. HOYER. Where does it come from then? Let me show a little chart that we have.

Mr. HOKE. Charts are good.

Mr. HOYER. Charts are good. We have agreed that charts are good, and it is confusing.

You did not like baselines. At the beginning of this session you wanted honest budgeting, no baselines.

Now, Mr. DEFAZIO is right. I happen to be someone who supports the Defense Department, believes we need a strong defense, have supported many of, frankly, Ronald Reagan's increases in the early 1980's. But the fact of the matter is Mr. DEFAZIO is correct.

On the one hand, if buying weapons costs you more year to year, buying food also costs you more year to year. So the baseline is no more than phony for one than it is for the other.

Now, because you think charts are good, let me show you these charts.

Mr. HOKE. I totally agree with you about baselines. The problem with

baselines is not taking into account the increases. It is deceiving the public about those increases.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time.

What you are saying, whether you are talking about defense or children's breakfast and lunch or whether you are talking about food for women, infants, and children so that mothers can be healthy in their prenatal period and babies can be healthy in the postnatal period and grow up healthy and able to learn, either way, you are talking about maintaining effort unless you have a decreased need.

And although I have not seen that, you responded that the number of kids increased, and you say that report shows that we are taking care of it.

Here is the chart that shows the difference between, and we use perhaps more programs here because the number is larger for all the programs that are included on this chart, which includes expenditures under current law for school meals, child care food, summer food, and the WIC program. 11.6, fiscal year 1995. 12.1 by the same products.

Mr. HOKE. Are you using home-based day care? Is that one of the programs you used?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. HOKE. There is the difference. That is a program we are cutting. It is a program that the administration called to cut. It is a program that the President wants cut. You are absolutely right. That is an area that is going to show a difference because we are cutting.

Mr. HOYER. So we have agreement. There is a cut.

Mr. HOKE. That is right. And the reason that the administration wants to have that cut is that it is not means tested. Everybody gets it. And we believe that only people that really need it should be getting these nutrition programs.

Mr. HOYER. We are going to run out of my 5 minutes real soon.

Mr. HOKE. I will give you more time. We have got all night.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time.

The fact of the matter is that those five nutritional programs, if they grew as the need would require to stay even, that is all we are talking about, to stay even. You would be at 15.9. But you are at 13.6, a two billion difference. Seven billion. That is where we get that seven billion. These years are a \$7 billion cut. Now, it is a cut, and you use it.

Mr. KASICH and the Budget Committee refers to this as we have got some savings from what they call, of course, a phoney baseline.

But the fact of the matter is, I want to tell you in Maryland our folks have reviewed this program and 37,000 children, real people, will have to be cut off the program if your program passes.

Now, that is what they say. They haven't seen CRS. That is what they say. Thirty-seven thousand kids are